

*California  
Commission on Teacher Credentialing*

*Meeting of  
September 5-6, 2001*

**AGENDA ITEM NUMBER:                    PREP - 4**

**COMMITTEE:** Preparation Standards

**TITLE:** Proposed Adoption of Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs

## XX Action

## Information

**Strategic Plan Goal(s):**

**Goal 1: Promote educational excellence in California schools**

- Develop candidate and program standards that guide our local communities in the education of their children
- Develop and administer teacher assessments

**Prepared By:**

**Margaret Olebe, Administrator  
Professional Services Division**

Date:\_\_\_\_\_

**Prepared By:**

**Amy Jackson, Administrator**  
**Professional Services Division**

Date:\_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewed By:**

**Mary Vixie Sandy, Director**  
**Professional Services Division**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Authorized By:**

**Sam W. Swofford, Ed.D.**  
**Executive Director**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_



# **Proposed Adoption of Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs**

**Professional Services Division  
August 21, 2001**

## **Executive Summary**

In September, 1998, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing launched an extensive standards and assessment development effort that led to the development of the attached draft standards of quality and effectiveness for professional teacher preparation programs. In January 2001, the Commission authorized an extensive field review of the draft standards, and in July a summary and analysis of field review findings were presented to the Commission. During July and August 2001, the attached standards were amended, based on field review findings and direction from the Commission and finalized for presentation to the Commission in September.

## **Policy Question**

Should the Commission adopt the attached Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs?

## **Fiscal Impact Summary**

The costs associated with developing and implementing new standards were estimated to be incurred over multiple years, and are included in the agency's base budget.

## **Recommendations**

1. That the Commission adopt the proposed Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs.
2. That the Commission adopt the proposed precondition regarding assessment of teacher candidate subject matter competence.



# **Proposed Adoption of Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation Programs**

**Preparation Standards Committee  
August 21, 2001**

## **Summary**

In September, 1998, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC) launched an extensive standards and assessment development effort that led to the development of the attached draft standards of quality and effectiveness for professional teacher preparation programs. In January 2001, the Commission authorized an extensive field review of the draft standards, and in July a summary and analysis of field review findings were presented to the Commission. During July and August 2001, the attached standards were amended, based on field review findings and direction from the Commission, and finalized for presentation to the Commission in September 2001.

## **Scope of Work**

The Advisory Panel for the Development of Teacher Preparation Standards was appointed by the Commission's Executive Director in September 1998 and charged with developing the following three policy documents for review and consideration by the Commission:

- New standards of quality and effectiveness for professional teacher preparation programs;
- Teaching Performance Expectations that would serve as the basis for evaluating the competence of teacher candidates on teaching performance assessments embedded in preparation programs;
- New standards of quality and effectiveness for professional teacher induction programs.

When adopted by the Commission, these documents will implement the structural changes in the teacher credentialing system that were called for in Senate Bill 2042 (Alpert/Mazzoni, 1998). Three significant changes enacted in this reform legislation are (1) alignment of all teacher preparation standards with the state-adopted academic content standards and performance levels for students and the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP), (2) the inclusion of a teaching performance assessment in preparation programs, and (3) a required induction period of support and formative assessment for all first and second year teachers.

In addition to these structural and thematic shifts in the Commission's credentialing system and standards, SB 2042 replaced the Professional Clear Credential course requirements in health, "mainstreaming" and technology with a requirement that essential preparation in these three areas be addressed in preparation and induction standards.

Follow-up legislation in 1999 (AB 1059 Ducheney) required that new standards for preparation and induction programs include preparation for all teachers to teach English learners in mainstream classrooms.

### **Development of the Standards**

The Advisory Panel worked for two years to develop standards that responded to these statutory requirements. To facilitate the work, a task force whose members have specific expertise in teacher induction was appointed as sub group of the panel to develop drafts of the professional teacher induction standards. The work of this group is described in Prep-5. The Advisory Panel reviewed a complete set of draft professional teacher preparation standards at its August 2000 meeting. At that time the Advisory Panel recommended that the draft standards could be brought forward for consideration by the Commission for release for field review.

In September 2000, the Chairman of the Commission asked two Commissioners to meet as a liaison committee with two members of the State Board of Education to review the standards. The broad charge to this liaison group was to ensure that these policy documents are, to the extent possible and appropriate, consistent with other significant policy reforms impacting the education of California's public school children. Commissioners Katzman and Wilson met with State Board of Education members Marion Bergeson and Marion Joseph in December 2000 to discuss preliminary draft standards, and received initial feedback and suggestions from the group. Overall, the liaison committee found the preliminary draft standards to be consistent with other major policy reforms currently underway in California. Minor edits and clarifications from the liaison committee were incorporated into the documents. The standards were released for field review in January 2001.

### **Results of the Field Review**

Draft standards were circulated widely throughout California beginning in January 2001. Responses to the standards were reviewed by the Panel at its first July meeting, and the Commission at its July 2001 meeting. The field review yielded several main response themes related to the proposed professional teacher preparation standards. They were:

- Large number of standards, their degree of specificity and the inclusion of required elements;
- Potential costs of transition to the new standards;
- Pressure on the one year program limitation given the specificity of the standards;
- Inadequate attention to family, equity and diversity;
- Challenge of meeting the field experience requirements and preparing field supervisors and cooperating teachers as teaching performance assessment assessors;
- Completion of the subject-matter requirement prior to student teaching is too strict given the frequency of subject matter examinations; and
- Need to increase content related to health.

The Advisory Panel reviewed these response themes in relation to provisions of SB 2042 and considered all responses from the field carefully. It decided to retain all the standards and required elements as essential to the proposed reform. Recognizing the potential strain on institutional capacity related to time and field experiences, the panel made some adjustments to the standards to address time-related concerns. To address concerns about subject matter requirement completion, the panel recommends that the Commission to retain the current four-fifths subject matter program completion requirement, adopt a new precondition with some modifications. The text of the proposed precondition is discussed in another section of this report. The panel inserted new language into Draft Standard 5 to meet the statutory requirements of AB 537 (Kuehl, 1999) and to address concerns related to equity and diversity. Finally, after much discussion and careful consideration of the extensive feedback received from the health community, the panel affirmed its decision to recommend the language related to health in Draft Standard 10 as written.

The Panel held its last meeting in July 2001 to finalize the standards and recommend their adoption by the Commission in September 2001.

### **Proposed Program Accreditation Precondition: Assessment of Candidates' Subject Matter Preparation**

During its deliberations the Advisory Panel focussed much of its work on the inclusion of subject-specific pedagogy in the teacher preparation program and alignment with the State-adopted academic content standards for students in California public schools. The panel felt that in the new system, meeting the subject matter requirement at the earliest reasonable time for candidates would be a high priority. To insure that program sponsors address subject matter competency at the outset of the program, it recommends the commission adopt the following precondition. This precondition would assure that each program sponsor includes an assessment of each individual candidate's subject matter competency as an admission criterion, and admits only those individuals who meet one of the criteria (a) through (f) described in the proposed precondition. Currently there is no such requirement. The existing requirement of completion of at least four-fifths of the subject matter requirement prior to full time student teaching is retained in the draft standards as well. Adoption of this precondition would strengthen attention to subject matter competency, yet provide sufficient flexibility for program sponsors and candidates in the opinion of the Panel.

#### Text of Proposed Precondition

The sponsor of a professional teacher preparation program assesses each candidate's standing in relation to required subject matter preparation during the admissions process. The program admits only those candidates who meet *one* of the following criteria:

- (a) the candidate provides evidence of having passed the appropriate subject matter examination(s); or

- (b) the candidate provides evidence of having attempted the appropriate subject matter examination(s); or
- (c) the candidate provides evidence of registration for the next scheduled examination; or
- (d) the candidate provides evidence of having completed an approved subject-matter waiver program; or
- (e) the candidate provides evidence of continuous progress toward meeting subject matter competency; or
- (f) the candidate provides evidence of enrollment in an organized subject matter examination preparation program.

### **Liaison with State Agencies**

The Advisory Panel held its last meeting in late July 2001 to finalize the standards for consideration and adoption by the Commission in September 2001. In the same month Professional Services Division Director Mary Vixie Sandy made a presentation to the State Board of Education (SBOE) on the Professional Teacher Preparation and Induction Standards at its regular meeting. State Superintendent of Public Instruction Delaine Eastin was present for the presentation. Board members expressed great interest in the standards and noted they were aligned with current policy work in K-12 education.

Two meetings of the CCTC/SBOE liaison group were held, one prior to the State Board of Education meeting in July and one in early August. Commissioners Carol Katzman and Margaret Fortune met with Board Members Nancy Ichinaga and Marion Joseph. Although the primary focus of those meetings was the professional teacher induction standards, the liaison group affirmed its support of the teacher preparation standards as aligned with current reforms in K-12 schools.

### **Development of the Teaching Performance Expectations**

One of the charges to the SB 2042 Advisory Panel was the development of Teaching Performance Expectations that represent the knowledge, skills and abilities that could be assessed on the newly required teaching performance assessment. Pursuant to statute, these performance expectations were required to undergo a validity study that would support their use in performance assessments.

The following steps were taken to develop the draft set of Teaching Performance Expectations. The Advisory Panel examined the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) and other state documents that set forth and define knowledge, skills and abilities beginning level teachers need to know and be able to do. Then teacher tasks, knowledge and abilities (TKAs) were developed under six critical domains of teaching, following the existing, previously validated, CSTP domains.

The Commission's contractor, WestEd, conducted a thorough job analysis. The analysis examined the question of importance for each TKA. A stratified random sample design was employed and a sufficient return rate was achieved. The data were analyzed and the

majority of TKAs were retained. WestEd drafted a set of Teaching Performance Expectations based on the retained TKAs.

A panel experts on the state-adopted academic content standards was convened examine the TPEs against the CSTP and the State-adopted academic content standards for students. The content specialists evaluated the degree to which the TPEs were aligned and congruent with the CSTP and the State-adopted academic content standards for students. The Commission's Bias Review Panel was convened to review the TPEs. The Bias review focused on finding language that would be unfair or offensive if adopted.

Findings from the alignment and congruence analysis and bias review were presented to the SB 2042 Advisory Panel resulting in minimal changes were made to the TPEs. The Alignment and Congruence findings supported that the TPEs were aligned to and congruent with both the CSTP and the State adopted academic content standards for students. Based on these findings and recommendations, Commission staff revised the TPEs and presented a draft to the Commission in January 2001.

Under a contract with the Commission, American Institutes for Research (AIR) worked with Commission staff to design a validity study of the TPEs. Surveys were designed for teachers, principals and teacher education faculty. A focus group was conducted with parents to review the TPEs. The two main questions posed in the validity survey had to do with the importance of each TPE to teaching and whether each TPE was necessary for teachers to know and do at the beginning of their career as a teacher. 1,598 (28.8%) teacher surveys, 154 (49.5%) principal surveys and 264 (23.6%) university faculty surveys were completed and used in the final validity analysis of the data.

AIR prepared and presented TPE validity data findings to the Advisory Panel in July 2001. Nine of the 16 TPEs did not meet the "Necessary at Entry" threshold set by the CCTC and AIR. All 16 met the 'Importance' threshold.

CCTC and AIR developed item review guidelines for the Advisory Panel based on guidelines developed for the job analysis study. Data were presented to the panel and 13 TPEs were retained. TPEs that were not fully supported by the validity survey data were retained based on their linkage to the State-adopted academic content standards for students. The Advisory Panel approved all 13 TPEs unanimously. The final TPEs appear in Appendix A of Attachment 1.

In August, the original panel of student content standards specialists was re-convened to examine the final TPEs against the CSTP and the State-adopted academic content standards for students. Again, the panel was asked to determine alignment and congruence with the CSTP and the State-adopted academic content standards for students. In addition, the Commission's Bias Review Panel was convened in August 2001 to conduct a final review of the TPEs.

Both the Alignment and Congruence Study and the Bias Review process supported the thirteen TPEs with minor edits.

## **Systemic Impact**

Implementing the newly adopted standards for professional teacher preparation will present some new challenges to institutions of higher education and local education agencies. Sponsors of approved programs that meet credentialing requirements have built the capacity to respond to newly adopted standards into their ongoing work. They expect that accreditation visits will take place on a regular basis and that new documents will be prepared for those visits, as well as in response to new standards adopted by the Commission between visits. For example, sponsors of approved multiple and single subject programs have responded to the new reading and technology standards during the past four years in addition to preparing self-study documents for accreditation visits. At the same time, it must be recognized that the standards developed pursuant to SB 2042 are more complex and descriptive than the currently adopted standards and represent a shift from a segmented to a systemic approach to learning to teach. For the first time, it will be necessary for program sponsors to be knowledgeable about the entire learning to teach continuum and to be in dialogue with individuals and organizations functioning in other phases of the system.

This system aligns content and processes for learning to teach in new ways. Key features include the emphasis on alignment with the state adopted academic content standards and performance levels for students in K-12 public schools in California; a focus on subject-specific pedagogy; alignment of program and examination specifications; introduction of the teaching performance assessment; and inclusion of induction as a credentialing requirement. The content of subject matter preparation and teacher education has also been redistributed across the phases. These changes will cause program sponsors to examine how time, personnel and financial resources should be redistributed as they redesign their programs. At a minimum sponsoring organizations will need to: (1) provide professional development for all faculty and staff in the new standards and specifications; (2) redesign currently approved programs to meet the new standards; (3) modify or develop supporting mechanisms to meet new requirements; (4) create and/or strengthen internal and external partnerships across the system; and (5) determine how resources will be allocated or reallocated to support the newly redesigned program.

Sponsoring organizations will engage in all or some of these activities during the transition depending on the design of their currently approved programs and on their current level of readiness to transition. Staff conversations with faculty, directors of teacher education and deans of education indicate that some program sponsors have been engaged in dialogue and readiness activities over the past year or more as they followed the progress of the advisory panel through reports to the Commission and during the field review. Others are at earlier stages of readiness. At this time at least three institutions of higher education have elected to use the new standards for professional teacher preparation as alternative standards for their Spring 2002 accreditation visits. An Early Adopter Request for Proposal (RFP) for elementary subject matter preparation and professional teacher preparation program sponsors, funded through the Federal Title 2 Teacher Quality Grant and described in PREP - 6, will be released to encourage participation and build capacity for the new system.

Since this a complex transition, staff is recommending a structured twenty-seven months implementation plan also described in PREP - 6. This plan includes extensive technical assistance to sponsoring organizations as they plan and prepare for the new system. Commission staff and BTSA field staff will hold workshops throughout the state at the start of the process in Winter 2002 and provide follow-up support through individual consultations. In this way, it will be possible to monitor the progress of program sponsors as they prepare to submit new documents, and adjust the implementation process and timeline as needed.

### **Proposed Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for Professional Teacher Preparation**

Table 1 summarizes the content and purposes of the proposed new standards the full text of which are included in Attachment 1.

Important Note: The Assessment Quality Standards that have been included under Category E in previous drafts of these Standards are not being recommended for adoption at this time. The Commission recently authorized the Executive Director to enter into a contract with Education Testing Services to develop a model teaching performance assessment. Commission staff are currently consulting with EST about the nature and content of the assessment quality standards. Staff will bring a report and recommended assessment quality standards to the Commission in the coming months following this consultation.



**Table 1. Professional Teacher Preparation Standards**

<b>Categories of Proposed Standards</b>	<b>Purpose of Each Proposed Category</b>
<p><b>Category A: Program Design, Governance and Thematic Qualities</b></p> <p>Standard 1: Program Design  Standard 2: Collaboration in Governing the Program  Standard 3: Relationships between Theory and Practice  Standard 4: Pedagogical Thought and Reflective Practice  Standard 5: Equity, Diversity and Access to the Core Curriculum</p>	<p><b>Purpose:</b></p> <p>Category A describes various design elements that must be addressed by sponsors of teacher preparation programs in order to develop and deliver high quality teacher preparation.</p>
<p><b>Category B: Preparation to Teach Curriculum in California Schools</b></p> <p>Standard 6: Opportunities to Learn, Practice and Reflect On Teaching in All Subject Areas  Standard 7: Preparation to Teach Reading-Language Arts  Standard 8: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject Specific Content Instruction  Standard 9: Use of Technology in the Classroom</p>	<p><b>Purpose:</b></p> <p>Category B establishes direct linkages with the state-adopted academic content standards for students, and describes ways in which sponsors of teacher preparation must prepare Multiple and Single Subject Credential candidates to teach to these standards.</p>
<p><b>Category C: Preparation to Teach Students Enrolled in California Schools</b></p> <p>Standard 10: Preparation for Learning to Create a Supportive Healthy Environment for Student Learning  Standard 11: Preparation to Use Educational Ideas and Research  Standard 12: Professional Perspectives Toward Student Learning And the Teaching Profession  Standard 13: Preparation to Teach English Learners  Standard 14: Preparation to Teach Special Populations</p>	<p><b>Purpose:</b></p> <p>Category C addresses major concepts and principles related to how teachers understand, teach, and interact with their students. The standards in this category focus on the environment for student learning, professional dispositions and perspectives toward students, and the development of additional pedagogical skills for teaching English learners.</p>
<p><b>Category D: Supervised Fieldwork in the Program</b></p> <p>Standard 15: Structured Sequence of Supervised Fieldwork  Standard 16: Selection of Fieldwork Sites and Qualifications Of Field Supervision  Standard 17: Candidate Qualifications for Teaching Responsibilities In the Fieldwork Sequence  Standard 18: Pedagogical Assignments and Formative Assessments During the Program</p>	<p><b>Purpose:</b></p> <p>Category D describes the ways in which field experiences should be structured to provide candidates for Multiple and Single Subject Teaching Credentials with multiple opportunities to practice their teaching skills prior to earning their Credentials.</p>

**Table 1. Professional Teacher Preparation Standards, Continued**

Categories of Proposed Standards	Purpose of Each Proposed Category
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Teaching Performance Expectations</b></p> <p><b>Making Subject Matter Comprehensible to Students</b>  1. Specific Pedagogical Skills for Subject Matter Instruction (reading/ language arts, math, science history/social science)</p> <p><b>Assessing Student Learning</b>  2. Monitoring Student Learning During Instruction  3. Interpretation and Use of Assessments</p> <p><b>Engaging and Supporting Students in Learning</b>  4. Making Content Accessible  5. Student Engagement  6. Developmentally-appropriate Teaching Practices  7. Teaching English Learners</p> <p><b>Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for Students</b>  8. Learning about Students  9. Instructional Planning</p> <p><b>Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning</b>  10. Instructional Time  11. Social Environment</p> <p><b>Developing as a Professional Educator</b>  12. Professional, Legal and Ethical Obligations  13. Professional Growth</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Purpose</b></p> <p>The Teaching Performance Expectations (TPEs) represent the knowledge, skills and abilities that can be assessed in an embedded teaching performance assessment.</p>